WEMMH/SB/21 (4/03)

TRANSMITTAL	Application Number	10/766,357
INAMOMITTAL	Filing Date	January 28, 2004
FORM	First Named Inventor	Brian LAW HEGELY
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Group Art Unit	3/34
	Examiner Name	Philippe Derakshani SEP 1 3
Total Number of Pages in this Submission 4	Attomey Docket Number	1104-764/ RKE-079
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
Fee Transmittal Form	Assignment Pepers	After Allowance Communication to Group
Fee Attached see PTO-2038 form	Drawing(s)	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
Response to Restriction Requirement	Licensing-related Papers	Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
After Final	To Convert a Provisional Ap	pplication Proprietary Information
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, and Correspondence Address F	orm Status Letter
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer	Additional Enclosure (please identify below)
Express Abandonment Request	Small Entity Statement	Return Receipt Postcard
Information Disclosure Statement	Request for Refund	
Certified Copy of Priority Documents		
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application	temarks	•
Response to Missing Parts under . 37 CRF 1.52 or 1.53		
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT		
Firm James M. Durlacher or Individual Name Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP		
Signeture James M. Duracher		
Date September 13, 2006		
Certificate of Mailing		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being telefaxed to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 via Telefax No. 671-273-8300 on this date: September 13, 2006		
Typed or printed James M. Durlacher, Reg. No. 28,840		
Signature James M. Durlacher Date September 13, 2006		

1104-764:JMD:#419279 IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE In re patent application of: Before the Examiner I hereby certify that this correspondence is being telefaxed to the United States Patent and Brian LAW, et al. Trademark Office via Fax No. (571)-273-8300 Philippe Derakshani OΠ September 13, 2006 Serial No. 10/766,357 (Date of Deposit) Group Art Unit 3754 Filed January 28, 2004 James M. Durlacher Name of Registered Representative September 13, 2006 CHILD-RESISTANT DISPENSING) Signature PUMP September 13, 2006 Date of Signature RESPONSE TO

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated August 18, 2006, Applicants provisionally elect Species 1 directed to FIGS. 1-4, with traverse. The claims encompassing the elected species are believed to be claims 1-9.

It is the opinion of the Applicants that the various inventive features represented by FIGS. 5-16, identified by the Examiner as Species 2-8, are closely related to the same basic structure that is broadly disclosed and claimed in the application. As the disclosure progresses from FIGS. 1-4 on to the other drawing figures, additional features and options are disclosed. However, for the most part these additional features and options do not create any significant changes to the basic operational structure and theory as illustrated in FIGS. 1-4. Rather than making any significant changes to the structure of

Response to Restriction Requirement Serial No. 10/766,357 Group Art Unit 3754 Atty. Docket No. 1104-764/ RKE-079 Page 1 of 3 FIGS. 1-4, these subsequent drawing figures add features that can be used, consistent with the basic theme and construction of the disclosed invention.

For example, FIGS. 5 and 6 disclose specific styles of manual release features as options to the basic structure of FIGS. 1-4. The basic operation of the structural embodiment in FIGS. 1-4 is not changed by the addition of these features from FIGS. 5 and 6, as these manual release features are simply additional options that can be used.

It is believed that a thorough prior art search by the Examiner directed to the structure of FIGS. 1-4 would inevitably produce references, if any exist, that would be relevant to the additional features represented by FIGS. 5-16, i.e., Species 2-8. As such, there does not appear to be any undue hardship nor any extra burden imposed on the Examiner by asking the Examiner to consider all species and all claims together.

Even if the Examiner decides to maintain the Restriction Requirement and the eight (8) species, and as such not consider all species and all claims together at this time, a further request is being made to consider putting Species 1 and 4 together in view of what is represented and illustrated by FIGS. 7-9. The claims to be considered (claims 1-9), based upon the election of Species 1 corresponding to FIGS. 1-4, do not change. However, the claim listing could change in the future and the option of claiming more specifically the structural details represented by FIGS. 7-9 may be desired. Considering the various features and options represented by the various species, Species 1 and 4 are believed to be the closest in terms of correlation and are respectfully requested to be considered together.

Response to Restriction Requirement
Serial No. 10/766,357 Group Art Unit 3754
Atty. Docket No. 1104-764/ RKE-079
Page 2 of 3

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Response. Please provide any additional extensions of time which are required and charge any additional fees which may be due or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 23-3030.

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Durlacher, Reg. No. 28,840

Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty,

McNett & Henry LLP 111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

(317) 634-3456